

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

**Tuesday, April 21, 2009
6:30 P.M. – City Council Chambers
Rockford City Hall, 425 East State Street**

Present:

ZBA Members: Alicia DiBenedetto Neubauer
Aaron Magdziarz
Craig Sockwell
Julio Salgado
Dan Roszkowski

Absent: Scott Sanders

Staff: Todd Cagnoni, Deputy Director, Construction & Development Services
Sandra Hawthorne – Administrative Assistant
Jon Hollander – City Engineer, Public Works
Mark Marinaro - Fire Prevention Division
Attorney Kerry Partridge

Others: Kathy Berg, Stenographer
Applicants and Interested Parties

Acting Chairman Roszkowski called the meeting to order at 7:20 PM.

Sandra Hawthorne explained the format of the meeting will follow the Boards Rules of Procedure generally outlined as:

The Chairman will call the address of the application.

- The Applicant or representative are to come forward and be sworn in.
- The Applicant or representative will present their request before the Board
- The Board will ask any questions they may have regarding this application.
- The Chairman will then ask if there are any Objectors or Interested Parties. Objectors or Interested Parties are to come forward at that time, be sworn in by the Chairman, and give their name and address to the Zoning Board secretary and the stenographer
- The Objector or Interested Party will present all their concerns, objections and questions to the Applicant regarding the application.
- The Board will ask any questions they may have of the Objector or Interested Party.
- The Applicant will have an opportunity to rebut the concerns, answer questions of the Objector or Interested Party
- No further discussion from the Objector or Interested Party will occur after the rebuttal of the Applicant.

The Board will then discuss the application and a vote will be taken.

It was further explained to the public in attendance, applicants, objectors and interested parties that this meeting is not a final vote on any item. The date of the next meeting was given as Monday, May 4th, at 4:30 PM in Conference Room A of this building. The public in attendance, applicants, objectors and interested parties were instructed that they could contact Sandra Hawthorne in the Zoning Office for any

future information and that her phone number was listed on the top of the agenda which was made available to all those in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

A **MOTION** was made by Aaron Magdziarz to **APPROVE** the minutes of the March 17th meeting as submitted. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0, with Scott Sanders absent.

008-09 **508 East State Street** **(Laid Over from March)**
Applicant The Element c/o Riverfront Development
Ward 3 **Special Use Permit** for a Mural in a C-4, Urban Mixed-Use Zoning District

This item was Laid Over from the March Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The subject property is located on the north side of East State Street, 67 feet east of 2nd Street. Ed McCullough, representing The Element, reviewed the request. The location of the mural will be on the western wall of 508 East State Street. Several drawings representing the style of this mural was included in the Staff Report. It is anticipated there will be several murals over time representing public art. Mr. McCullough stated the owners of the building are excited about this venture and allowing the use of the building wall for free. Rock Valley College has contributed approximately \$6,000 to this project. A final drawing has not been determined as yet, but will be submitted to Staff for their approval. Installation date is anticipated as the first or second week of July.

Staff Recommendation was for Approval with 3 conditions. No Objectors or interested parties were present.

A **MOTION** was made by Craig Sockwell to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit for a Mural in a C-4, Urban Mixed-Use Zoning District at 508 East State Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Aaron Magdziarz and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Mounting of mural panels must be according to request; any modifications to materials and/or image of mural will require a Modification of Special Use Permit.
2. A sign Permit shall be required, including illustrations of proposed paintings for Staff's review and approval.
3. The mural panels may not consist of a vinyl banner material within a frame.

ZBA 008-09
Findings of Fact for a Special Use Permit
For a Mural in a c-4, Urban Mixed-Use Zoning District at
508 East State Street

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.

4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the C-4, Urban Mixed-Use Zoning District in which it is located.

011-09 4404 East State Street

Applicant Doyle Signs, Inc.

Ward 10 **Variation** to increase the maximum allowable height from (8) eight feet to 18'6" for a freestanding sign in a C-3, General Commercial District

This item was Laid Over from the March meeting. The subject property is located on the north side of East State Street, 148 feet west of North Alpine Road. Terrence Doyle from Doyle Signs, and Tom Baudhuin, owner of Alpine Inn, were present. Mr. Doyle stated the existing sign has been in place for over 40 years. He feels the existing 24 foot sign is easily recognized and provides an important landmark in assisting patrons to the entrance of the parking lot. He explained the Applicant is proposing a modification of the existing structure with installation of a new sign that is 6 feet lower and 1/3 smaller than the existing sign. Mr. Doyle feels this would be an improvement and an asset to the business. He stated the City's new ordinance discriminates against small businesses. The current sign ordinance limits the elevation to 8 feet for one business on one parcel. He feels a lower sign would be hidden by traffic, and would reduce the visibility of the business, especially for those drivers on the inside lanes. Mr. Doyle reviewed the Findings of Fact from the viewpoint that the proposed sign will not be detrimental to the area. He also feels an unsafe sign is one that the public cannot see or read readily. Mr. Baudhuin wished to address the safety issue. It is his opinion that the new sign is safer because it allows better visibility through the structure, which would be safer than a monument sign. He pointed out that there are approximately 41 signs that exceed the 8' limit in the surrounding area. Mr. Baudhuin felt the other option would be to put another sign on the existing structure that has been there for over 40 years, but feels a more modern sign would improve the appearance of the property.

Staff Recommendation was for Denial. No Objectors or interested parties were present.

Ms. Neubauer stated the sign ordinance was revised recently so the 41 existing signs discussed by Mr. Doyle would not be relevant. She also stated she doesn't believe she has ever gone through this intersection without having to stop at the intersection light, which would allow patrons sufficient time to view the Applicant's sign. Mr. Cagnoni explained a sign at Aunt Mary's restaurant across the street had to be lowered because a portion of the sign was higher than allowed. He also pointed out that CVS Store just up the street was told their signage needed to comply with the Ordinance. Mr. Roszkowski feels the proposed sign is an improvement over the existing sign, but agrees it does not meet the sign ordinance. Ms. Neubauer stated ten or twenty years from now as businesses change, signs will be more in conformance and of the same height as the Applicant's sign.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Neubauer to **DENY** the Variation to increase the maximum allowable height from (8) feet to 18'6" for a freestanding sign in a C-3, General Commercial District at 4404 East State Street. The **Motion Died** for lack of a Second. A second **MOTION** was made by Craig Sockwell. Sockwell motioned to **APPROVE** Variation to increase the maximum allowable height from (8) feet to 18'6" for a freestanding sign in a C-3, General Commercial District at 4404 East State Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Aaron Magdziarz and **FAILED** by a vote of 2 to 3, with Julio Salgado, Alicia Neubauer, and Dan Roszkowski voting Nay. A third **MOTION** was made by Alicia Neubauer to **DENY** the Variation to increase the maximum allowable height from (8) feet to 18'6" for a freestanding sign in a C-3, General Commercial District at 4404 East State Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Julio Salgado and

CARRIED by a vote of 3-2, with Aaron Magdziarz and Craig Sockwell voting Nay.

ZBA 011-09
Findings of Fact for a Variation
To Increase the Maximum Allowable Sign Height
From Eight Feet (8') to Eighteen Feet Six Inches (18'6")
In a C-3, General Commercial District at
4404 East State Street

Denial of this Variation is based upon the following findings:

1. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would not result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.
2. The conditions upon which a petition for this Variation are based are not unique to the property for which the Variation is sought and are applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
3. The purpose of this Variation is based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the property.
4. The alleged difficulty or hardship is not caused by this Ordinance and has been created by any persons presently having an interest in the property or by any predecessor in title.
5. The granting of this Variation will be detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. The sign height would not be consistent to surrounding properties that have new signs to comply with the current ordinance of eight feet (8') high.
6. The proposed Variation will impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion of the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair the property values within the neighborhood.
7. The proposed Variation does not comply with the spirit and intent of restrictions imposed by this Ordinance.

012-09 Applicant Ward 1	<u>7548-7698 Western Gales Rd & 1485-1495 Bonny Bridge Lane</u> Attorney Gino Galluzzo Modification of Special Use Permit #032-05 to change eleven (11) six-family residential condominiums and one (1) three-family condominium to nine (9) five-family and three (3) six-family condominiums in an R-3, Multi-family Residential Zoning District and a C-1, Limited Office Zoning District
--------------------------------------	--

This item was advertised as a Modification to change twelve (12) six-family residential condominiums to eight (8) five-family condominiums and four (4) six-family condominiums. The Applicant has since revised his request as stated above. Attorney Gino Galluzzo and Joseph Anderson, Architect for this project, were present. Attorney Galluzzo reviewed the request. He explained the Applicant is still meeting the conditions of the Special Use Permit because the criteria has not changed, and they are reducing density on the east and north edge. With the new design presented, the average size of the units have increased.

Ms. Neubauer asked for clarification of the term “wood shake”. Mr. Anderson stated they would match the design of those structures on the site now.

Staff Recommendation was based on the revised request and is for Approval with 4 conditions. Two Objectors were present.

Kurt and Geneve Harris, 7583 Western Gales Drive presented their objections. Mr. Harris stated he does not feel the development has been forthcoming as to reasons for this change. Under this request, not as many people will be paying into the Association and upkeep of the property. He asked the Applicant why they are changing the plan now when only 22 units have been constructed to date and very few have been sold. Attorney Galluzzo explained the units discussed were always meant to be larger number of units. They are a different size that hits a different market group. He stated this is a different type of product and will get the land into productive use with products that will move. The plan was redesigned to meet what the Applicants feel is a greater market demand. He explained the Master Association pays for the retention ponds and common elements. The Condo Association pays for snow removal and similar type of expenses. Mrs. Harris stated the main reason they purchased their condo was because of the quality. She feels their condo is now a more downscale unit than the new proposed units and is concerned this could negatively affect their value. Attorney Galluzzo again responded this decision was to try to meet market demand.

Ms. Neubauer asked Mr. Cagnoni to explain Staff’s concerns with the type of design elements proposed. Mr. Cagnoni explained the intent was to add more brick to the visible elevations. She also questioned the different type of windows on the back elevations in comparison to the front. Mr. Anderson stated the five family units would have consistent windows around the elevation.

A **MOTION** was made by Craig Sockwell to **APPROVE** the Modification of Special Use Permit #032-05 to change eleven (11) six-family residential condominiums and one (1) three-family condominium to nine (9) five-family and three (3) six-family condominiums in an R-3, Multi-family Residential Zoning District and a C-1, Limited Office Zoning District at 7548-7698 Western Gales Road and 1485-1495 Bonny Bridge Lane. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Alicia Neubauer and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Must meet applicable building and fire codes.
2. Submittal of Building permits for Staff review and approval.
3. Submittal of revised Elevations for Staff review and approval.
4. Site must be developed in accordance with site plan.

ZBA 012-09
Findings of Fact for a Modification of Special Use Permit #032-05
To Change Eleven Six-Family Residential Condominiums
And One Three-Family Condominium
To Nine, Five-Family and Three, Six-Family Condominiums
In an R-3, Multi-family Residential Zoning District and
C-1, Limited Office Zoning District at
7548-7698 Western Gales Road -and-
1485-1595 Bonny Bridge Lane

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.

2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the R-3 and C-1 Districts. As part of the PRD regulations unique design and site planning is encouraged.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the R-3 and C-1 Zoning Districts in which it is located.

013-09

Applicant
Ward 1

725 North Lyford Road

Rockford Mass Transit District

Renewal of Special Use Permit #079-06 (2007-85-0) for a Planned Mixed-Use Development for a bus terminal center, including joint development of retail spaces and parking in a C-3, General Commercial District

Acting Chairman Roszkowski abstained - Aaron Magdziarz took over as Acting Chairman for this item. The subject property is located approximately 824 feet north of E. State Street on the east side of Lyford Road. The existing Special Use Permit was approved April 30, 2007 and must be renewed prior to expiration. Approval was subject to 4 conditions. James Johnson, Project Manager for the Rockford Mass Transit District reviewed the request. He explained that bus service to Belvidere is now part of federal funding. Because funding is primarily Federal funds and some State funds, it was a requirement to get an environmental assessment, review appraisal of the property, and several other preparatory requirements before actually purchasing the land. Once the land was purchased, the Applicant then had to get approval of an Architect that met detailed State requirements. Mr. Johnson explained they are now nearing completion of the schematic design process.

A **MOTION** was made by Alicia Neubauer to **APPROVE** the Renewal of Special Use Permit #079-06 (2007-85-0) for a Planned Mixed-Use Development for a bus terminal center, including joint development of retail spaces and parking in a C-3, General Commercial District at 725 North Lyford Road. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 4-0, with Dan Roszkowski abstaining.

Approval is subject to the 4 original conditions:

1. Meeting all applicable building and fire codes.
2. Submittal of a detailed site plan, landscaping plan and illumination plan for Staff's review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. Submittal of a building design elevation for Staff's review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. That a Tentative Plat and Final Plat is approved for the property in accordance with the City's Subdivision regulation inclusive of required public improvements to Lyford Road prior to issuance of a building permit and development of site.

ZBA 013-09
Findings of Fact for Renewal of Special Use Permit #079-06 (2007-85-0)
For a Planned Mixed-Use Development for a Bus Terminal Center,
Including Joint Development of Retail Spaces and Parking
In a C-3, General Commercial Zoning District at
725 North Lyford Road

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the C-3 Zoning District in which it is located.

014-09 Applicant Ward 3	<u>1105, 1131 N. Court Street & 1124, 1126 North Church Street</u> Atty. Nancy Hyzer Modification of Special Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development from a condominium development to fee simple lots in a R-2, Two-family Residential Zoning District
--------------------------------------	---

The subject property is located north of John Street, east of Court Street, west of Church Street, and is the former Garrison School. Attorney Nancy Hyzer reviewed the application. She explained the development plan has been changed, triggered by the change in the market. The modification is really a change in ownership rather than the substance of the project. Owners will now also purchase the land on which the unit stands. Lot 11 will be replatted to allow for individual spaces for the townhome development. Landscaping will be maintained by the Homeowners Association. The buildings along John and Church Streets are currently under construction. The garages that service the school and gymnasium will also be eventually sold to the owners of the units of the original building. Attorney Hyzer explained the modification is not in the original physical form, but rather in the change in ownership. She stated it is easier to obtain mortgages on a single family townhome, according to financial lenders. Mr. Roszkowski clarified that nothing has changed as to what is going on the property.

Ms. Neubauer asked what happens to maintenance issues and repairs to common areas under this plan. Attorney Hyzer stated there is an association in place prior to any of the units being sold.

Staff Recommendation was for approval with 5 conditions. No Objectors or interested parties were present.

Mr. Cagnoni wished to clarify that under condition 5, the word “underground” should be removed, as there is no underground parking. Attorney Hyzer explained that the garages will be available for purchase with the condominium development. Mr. Cagnoni stated if this was confusing, condition 5 could be stricken. Staff is understanding of how parking will be provided in the future.

A **MOTION** was made by Aaron Magdziarz to **APPROVE** the Modification of Special Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development from a condominium development to fee simple lots in a R-2, Two-family Residential Zoning District at 1105, 1311 North Court Street and 1124, 1126 North Church Street with the elimination of condition 5. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Must meet applicable building and fire codes.
2. Meeting all applicable building codes, specifically documentation from a licensed design professional (Architect), licensed in the State of Illinois indicating the current construction does not violate any building code requirements in regard to the property line being through the existing building.
3. Submittal of Building Permits for Staff review and approval.
4. Site must develop in accordance with site plan on file.

ZBA 014-09
Findings of Fact for a Modification of Special Use Permit
For a Planned Unit Development
In an R-2, Two-Family Residential Zoning District
From a Condominium Development to Fee Simple Lots at
1105 and 1131 North Court Street
1124-1126 North Church Street

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the R-2 Zoning District. As part of the PRD regulations, unique design and site planning is encouraged.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the R-2 Zoning District in which it is located.

015-09 **7130 East State Street**
Applicant Paul Hemmer Companies
Ward 1 **Special Use Permit** for a restaurant with Drive-Thru in the C-2, Limited Commercial
Zoning District

The subject property is located on the northeast corner of Perryville Road and East State Street. Larry Peterman, representing the Applicant, reviewed the request. This is a subdivision of the existing Lowe's site. One of the properties is intended to be a restaurant with drive-thru, which requires a Special Use Permit. Access will be from Argus into the site, which also allows access to Lowe's. Mr. Peterman was concerned with Staff's access requirement but will be working with Public Works to come to an agreement. He stated no additional outlots are planned for this property. Mr. Roszkowski asked if there was a tenant for this restaurant. Mr. Peterman responded they are very close to determining occupancy, but did not reveal the potential tenant.

Staff Recommendation was for Approval with 6 conditions. No Objectors or interested parties were present.

A **MOTION** was made by Craig Sockwell to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit for a restaurant with Drive-Thru in the C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District at 7130 East State Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Aaron Magdziarz and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Meeting all applicable building and fire codes.
2. The property shall be replatted prior to building permitting.
3. Landscaping shall be as per Exhibit E, with final review and approval by staff.
4. Submittal of an illumination plan for staff review and approval.
5. Submittal of an elevation plan and final building materials for staff review and approval.
6. That a right turn lane shall be provided along Argus Drive or the outlots shall be shifted to the south to be reviewed and approved by the City of Rockford City Engineer.

ZBA 015-09
Findings of Fact for a Special Use Permit
for a Restaurant with Drive-Thru
In a C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District at
7130 East State Street

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.

6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District in which it is located.

016-09 **3780 East State Street**
Applicant Taboo Nightclub / John Kennedy
Ward 10 **Special Use Permit** for a nightclub in a C-2, Limited Commercial District

The subject property is located within a strip mall on the north side of East State Street.

Staff Recommendation was for Denial.

A **MOTION** was made by Alicia Neubauer to **LAY OVER** the Special Use Permit for a nightclub in a C-2, Limited Commercial District at 3780 East State Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Aaron Magdziarz and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

017-09 **6116 Mulford Village Drive**
Applicant Reynaldo Vera
Ward 1 **Special Use Permit** for an Entertainment Nightclub in a C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District

The subject property is located within a larger building, and is currently a bar and grill known as Miranda's. Attorney Nancy Hyzer, representing the Applicant, reviewed their request for Special Use Permit. She stated there are no physical changes in the site plan as that presented in the packet. the Applicant intends to remove a wall between the bar and customer area to provide a larger area. Mr. Salgado asked if they would be using the entrance from the mall. Attorney Hyzer stated this entrance will not be used, as it is not part of the tenant space.

Staff Recommendation was for Approval with 5 conditions. No Objectors were present.

A **MOTION** was made by Aaron Magdziarz to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit for an Entertainment Nightclub in a C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District at 6116 Mulford Village Drive. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Alicia Neubauer and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Meeting all applicable building and fire codes.
2. Submittal of an updated interior site plan for staff review and approval. The nightclub will be limited to the approved site plan.
3. Compliance with all City of Rockford Liquor Codes.
4. Security shall be provided as submitted and there shall be a ratio of one (1) per fifty (50) patrons.
5. The nightclub shall be limited to the interior tenant space as shown.

ZBA 017-09
Finding of Fact for a Special Use Permit
For an Entertainment Nightclub
In a C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District at
6116 Mulford Village Drive

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District in which it is located.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra A. Hawthorne, Administrative Assistant
Zoning Board of Appeals